THE

Right Method

For the proving of

INFANT-BAPTISM.

With ſome

REFLECTIONS

On ſome late *Tracts* againſt

INFANT-BAPTISM.

BIBLIOTHECA NATIONALIS BOSTONIENSIS

By *JOSEPH WHISTON*,
Miniſter of the Goſpel.

LONDON,
Printed for Jonathan Robinſon, at the Golden-Lion in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard, MDCXC.

The Right Method for the proving of INFANT-BAPTISM, *&c.*

THAT *Sacred Adagy* delivered to us by the Wiſe Man, *Prov.* 17. 14. is ſadly verified, not only in Temporal, but in Religious Contentions. Contentions once begun, be the Object or Subject Matter what it will, are ſeldom ſoon compoſed or ſuppreſſed, but often grow to greater Violence, and in reſpect of thoſe that are religious, unſuppreſſible, unleſs by the interpoſal of a Divine Hand. One Reaſon whereof is, becauſe the Parties litigant, act under the Inforcement of Conſcience, either regularly, guided by Divine Light, or miſguided by ſome Miſtake the Underſtanding lies under. 'Tis the unqueſtionable Duty of all Chriſtians, eſpecially the Miniſters of the Goſpel, who are Chriſt's Stewards, intruſted with the Preſervation as well as Diſpenſation of his Truth to the World, to contend for it as well as preach it, ſee *Jude* 3. Now the litigant Parties on both Hands ſuppoſe, at leaſt pretend, they are his Truths they contend for. Neither are all Contentions of this Kind abſolutely reproveable; the Sin uſually is rather in the manner of Management, than in the

Contentions themſelves, as abſolutely conſidered. All Truths (as muſt be granted on all Hands) are not revealed ſo evidently in the Scriptures, as to admit of no Debate about them. Now till Men diſcern what is Truth, it may be uſeful, yea a Duty, to contend for what at preſent they apprehend to be ſo. Yet this muſt be ſaid, that it is Matter of much Admiration, as well as great Lamentation, that after a long ventilation of diſputable Doctrines and Practices, all ſincere and intelligent Chriſtians, who have received any meaſure of that Unction from the Holy One, whereby the Laws of God are put into their Minds, and written in their Hearts; that is, an inward Principle and Diſpoſition is wrought in them, inclining them to a ready compliance with, and ſubmiſſion to the whole revealed Will of God, ſhould not diſcern on which ſide Truth lies, ſo as to coaleſce in the ſame Judgment and Practice. Shall we impute it to an Obſcurity in Divine Revelations? That would be a Reflection upon the Knowledg, Wiſdom, or Faithfulneſs of our Lord Chriſt, *in whom*, as the Apoſtle tells us, *are hid all the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledg*; and who, as the ſame Apoſtle aſſures us, *hath been faithful in all his Houſe*; the Fault therefore muſt lie on the part of Chriſtians themſelves. For inſtance, That the Doctrine and Practice of Infant-Baptiſm have been of a long time controverted in the Church, is known to all. Now whence it ſhould be that this Controverſy is not come to an Iſſue, conſidering what hath been ſaid on the one and the other Part,

but

but freſh Contentions ſhould ariſe, may juſtly require the moſt ſedate and ſerious Enquiry; but I ſhall not at preſent enlarge upon it. Two things I would only ſay;

Firſt, That on the Part of thoſe that have pleaded the Cauſe of Pædobaptiſm, I cannot but conclude, that many Miſtakes they have lain under, both about the Tenour of the Covenant, on which they have duly founded their Pleas, and about the Benefits accruing to Infants by their Covenant, Intereſt, and Baptiſm, did at the firſt in a great meaſure give Riſe to this Controverſy, and have contributed not a little to the long continuance of it. Had the true Tenour of *Abraham*'s Covenant been clearly diſcovered, aſſerted and eſtabliſhed by Scripture-Light, and the full Good and Benefit accruing to Infants from their Intereſt therein, and their Baptiſm, as the preſent Token of it, allowed to them in a conſiſtency with all the Truths of the Goſpel, I cannot but think that this Controverſy had been, if not wholly obviated, yet quickly ſuppreſſed among all ſincere and intelligent Chriſtians. To me 'tis paſt doubt that Miſtakes on the part of Pædobaptiſts, have greatly promoted the Cauſe of Antipædobaptiſm: this ſufficiently appears by ſome late Tracts by the Men of that Perſwaſion.

Secondly, On the part of the Antipædobaptiſts, I ſhall only ſay, that I do heartily wiſh, that if the Lord had ſeen it meet, there had been a more equal Dividend, that thoſe among them that are Men of greater Parts and Abilities, had a greater ſhare with their Brethren of

lower Parts and Abilities, in their Sincerity, Simplicity, and Love unto Truth, and those weaker Ones had a greater share with their Brethren in those Parts and Abilities they have attained to. Some seem sufficiently furnished with Abilities for the finding out, at least discerning Truth when set before them, and yet by one Means or another comply not with it, but on the other hand do oppose it: Others have sufficient Sincerity and Love to Truth, to ingage them to a compliance with it when discerned, but have not such acuteness of Understanding, nor solidity of Judgment, as is necessary for the finding out or discerning a Truth that lies at all below the very Surface of the Scriptures. I shall therefore, that I may reduce this Controversy into as narrow a compass, and thereby lay the whole of it within the view of the shortest and narrowest-sighted, as possibly I may; and also obviate all unnecessary Digladiations or Impertinences on the one Hand or the other, present, as it were, in a short Scheme, the Method I have proceeded in, in the Pleas I have made on behalf of the Covenant-Interest and Baptism of the Infant-Seed of Believers, and in which I judg it absolutely necessary, that whoever will successfully plead the same Cause, do proceed. And thus in the general I have laid the Foundation to the Pleas I have made in that Covenant entered with *Abraham*, recorded in *Gen.* 17. 7. For though there be much in the New Testament strongly perswading that it is the Mind and Will of our Lord Christ, that the Infant-Seed of his People

People ſhould be by Baptiſm ſolemnly dedicated to him, as joint Confederates with their Parents, yet it muſt be granted that his Mind and Will is not ſo fully and clearly revealed therein, as to admit of no Debates about it. Will we have full Satisfaction about the Mind and Will of our Lord Chriſt, with reference to this Practice, we muſt enter at the Revelations he hath made thereof, in the firſt eſtabliſhment of that Covenant with *Abraham.*

Yet let me add, that I ſuppoſe there is a Miſtake in the Recommenders of a late Tract, paſſing under the Name of Mr. *Philip Cary* to the World, when they ſay that ſome of the Pædobaptiſts themſelves do confeſs, that Arguments taken from the Baptizing of whole Families, from Chriſt's bleſſing little Children, and from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. have no weight in them. I remember not that any have confeſſed ſo much, I am ſure they had no Reaſon ſo to do. We only ſay, that thoſe and the like Scriptures, as taken abſtractly by themſelves, do not make ſuch a full, clear, and convincing diſcovery of the Mind of our Lord Chriſt in this Matter, as to ſet this Practice above all rational Doubts. There is undoubtedly much, yea very much Weight in them, eſpecially when added as a farther Confirmation of what is pleaded from this Covenant: and let any Baptiſts pretend what they will, they never have, nor will be able to anſwer ſome of thoſe Arguments Mr. *Baxter* hath urged from that 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. But this I was ſaying in order to a full Eſtabliſhment of this Practice, 'tis abſolutely neceſſary that a

Foundation be laid where I have laid it, *viz.* in the fore-mentioned Covenant. But more particularly that this Foundation may be ſurely laid, as I have done, ſo all others ingaging in the ſame Cauſe, muſt do theſe five things.

(1.) It muſt be ſolidly proved, that this Covenant is not the Old Covenant which the Apoſtle tells is done away, but that it is the Covenant of Grace, that very Covenant under which Believers ſtill are. And I fear not falling under the Cenſure of over-Confidence in the Minds or Judgments of judicious and unbiaſſed Perſons, if I ſay this is fully done already. See among others my Anſwer to Mr. *Cox*, p. 95, to the 139. with the places there referred unto, where I have demonſtrated theſe three Poſitions.

1. That God in thoſe Tranſactions with *Abraham*, recorded *Gen.* 12. at the beginning, did not make or eſtabliſh the Covenant of Grace with him: My meaning is, he did not then compleat the Covenant of Grace with him. This I grant, that God did then begin to deal with *Abraham* with reference to his eſtabliſhing his Covenant with him; did as it were draw the firſt Lines of that Covenent he intended afterwards in a more formal expreſs manner to enter with him. Hence the Apoſtle *Peter*, telling the Jews that they were the Children of the Covenant, cites one Promiſe then made to *Abraham*, Acts 3. 26.

2. That the Covenant recorded in *Gen.* 17. 7. is not the Old Covenant, nor had any reference or relation thereunto.

3. That

3. That that Covenant is the Covenant of Grace, the ſame which Believers are ſtill under. And would our Oppoſers ſatisfy the World in their Judgments and Practice, they ought to return ſolid and ſatisfactory Anſwers to thoſe Arguments pleaded in Confirmation of each of thoſe Poſitions; their Silence wherein renders all their Diſcourſes utterly inſignificant in the Judgment of all Men of a competent Underſtanding. Alas! can they think a looſe Diſcourſe, however filled up with Scripture-Quotations, can be of any uſe to ſuch Perſons, ſo long as thoſe Arguments remain unanſwered? And it ſeems ſtrange to me that Men of any Judgment, Gravity or Conſcience ſhould recommend to the World any Diſcourſes ſo exceſſively defective in that regard, in the Management of the Cauſe they plead. It being evinced and demonſtrated paſt all rational Contradiction, that this Covenant is not the Old Covenant, ſaid to be done away, but the Covenant of Grace. The moſt copious Harangue of Words, how many Scriptures ſoever are alledged therein, ſignifieth nothing, ſave only to ſhew how tenacious Men are of Error; and how they will wreſt and pervert the Scriptures, to confirm themſelves and others therein, when once embraced by them.

But it may be ſome will ſay, There are two Treatiſes, the one of Mr. *Grantham*'s, the other of Mr. *Philip Cary*'s, wherein there are ſeveral irrefragable Arguments to prove the contrary, *viz.* That that Covenant is not the Covenant of Grace. To that I anſwer, It is true, that there

there are such Books abroad; but so long as those Arguments remain unanswered, here is only the opposing of Arguments to Arguments, and which are the most valid and demonstrative, possibly Men of weaker Capacities are not able to determine to the Satisfaction of their own Consciences. Hence such Methods of Procedure serve only to confirm those that are before resolved, and puzzle weak conscientious Christians that are sincerely inquiring after Truth. I shall only add, that the Arguments I have laid down are unanswerable, is undoubted to me, the sure-footing they have in the Scriptures of Truth assures me of that; neither is the Silence of our Adversaries after their so long Presentation to publick View, any small Addition to that Assurance. I shall now try whether those Arguments laid down by the two fore-mentioned Authors be so or no.

To begin first with those laid down by Mr. *Grantham*; he attempts to prove two things.

1. That Circumcision was not a Gospel-Ordinance.
2. That that Covenant recorded *Gen.* 17. 7. is not a Covenant of Grace. For the

1. What he means by a Gospel-Ordinance, is to me difficult to determine; and therefore I shall only declare what I mean by a Gospel-Ordinance; and in brief, I mean an Ordinance or Act of Worship instituted in the Covenant of Grace, having an immediate and direct Respect

Respect thereunto, for the Confirmation, obtaining or conveying the Good therein promised. Now let us see the strength of his Arguments, and they are these three.

1. *That which could profit no Man, except he kept the whole Law, was no Gospel-Ordinance: but Circumcision could profit no Man, except he kept the whole Law*, Ergo, *&c.* And he cites *Rom.* 2. 25. for the Proof of his Minor Proposition.

Before I answer to either part of his Argument, I must distinguish of these two Terms [*Law* and *Keep*]. Thus by Law may be meant either the Moral Law, and that taken in a strict and proper Sense, as the Law or Covenant of Works, the Sum of which the *Holy Ghost* reduces to a *Do this, and live.* Or,

2. That Term *Law* may intend the whole Revealed Will of God concerning Man's Duty; and then under this Term Law, we are to include both the Moral, Ceremonial, and Judicial Law, and that in their utmost Extent and Latitude.

2. For that Term *Keep*, it may be meant either of a perfect, sinless keeping, so as the Persons so keeping the Law, shall live therein, according to that of the Apostle, *Gal.* 3. 12. Or,

2. It may be meant of a sincere and upright Keeping, so as not willingly or wilfully to fail in doing any thing required, or doing any thing forbidden. Now if Mr. *Grantham* takes these Terms in the first Sense, (which in case he doth) Law here can only refer to, or be understood of the Moral Law, and that as a

Law

Law of Works; ſeeing God never required of, or expected from his People a perfect ſinleſs Obedience to the Ceremonial Law, no, nor to the Moral Law, as the Rule of that Obedience he requires of his People. And then I deny the Minor Propoſition, and ſay, thoſe words of the Apoſtle prove it not; and my Reaſon is, becauſe the Apoſtle there ſpeaks of the Law as conſidered under another Notion, and of another manner of keeping than is intended by Mr. *Grantham*. But,

2. If Mr. *Grantham* underſtood theſe Terms [*Law* and *Keeping*] in the latter Senſe, then I deny the Major Propoſition, and affirm on the other hand, that that (take it of Circumciſion in particular) might be and was a Goſpel-Ordinance, which yet would not profit Men except they kept the whole Law, ſeeing it might and did profit them who did ſo keep the Law. Thus the Apoſtle affirms it did profit them that kept the Law. What is here ſaid of Circumciſion may be alike ſaid of Baptiſm. It profits not thoſe that keep not the Law in the latter Senſe before-mentioned; but as for thoſe that do ſo keep the Law, it doth profit them. No Ordinance will profit any Men in caſe of their failing in that Obedience indiſpenſably required in the Covenant they are under, which is no Argument at all that it is no Goſpel-Ordinance. Goſpel-Ordinances will not profit Men, as of themſelves, in caſe they are Hypocrites, and do not walk up to that Profeſſion they make; which is all that the Apoſtle intends in that place.

2. His

2. His ſecond Argument is this, *If Circumciſion bound Men to keep the whole Law, then it was no Goſpel-Ordinance*, &c. Before I return an Anſwer to this Argument, I ſhall premiſe, that by Law in *Gal.* 5. 3. which he cites to prove his Aſſumption, we are (as I ſuppoſe is granted on all hands) to underſtand the Moſaical Law, the Law given by *Moſes* at Mount *Sinai*, and that in the utmoſt Latitude and Extent of it. Now this Law may be conſidered two ways,

1. As given by God to the People of *Iſrael.*

2. As after miſinterpreted and miſunderſtood by them.

1. As given by God, it had only a Subſerviency to the Covenant of Grace, and anſwerably as in it there was a Revival of the Law given to *Adam* in Innocency; ſo there were various Sacrifices and Ceremonial Obſervations anew inſtituted, that ſo the People, ſeeing the Exactneſs and Severity of the Law, and finding their own Inability ſo to perform it as to live therein, they might be engaged to flee unto Chriſt, and take hold of the Covenant of Grace confirmed, (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *Gal.* 3. 17.) in him, whereunto they were guided by the Sacrifices, and thoſe other Ceremonial Obſervations. Hence the Law is ſaid to have been a School-Maſter, to bring them unto Chriſt, *Gal.* 3. 24. whether we read as in our Tranſlation, or only a School-Maſter unto Chriſt, it is all one, ſeeing a School-Maſter it was. Now take the *Law*, as thus given by God himſelf, and *Keeping* in the latter Senſe beforementi-

mentioned, I grant his Assumption, but deny the Consequence in the Major Proposition; and affirm, That tho Circumcision did bind Men to keep the whole Law during its continuance in the Church, yet it might be and was a Gospel-Ordinance: and supposing the Apostle only intends this Term [*Law*] in this Sense, yet he might justly argue against Circumcision, as laying them under this Obligation to keep the Law, because there was now a change and alteration in the Law. The whole Ceremonial Law was abrogated and laid aside: and for them to put themselves under an Obligation to keep a Law that was now abrogated, was sinful, and would have deprived them of any Benefit by Christ, tho they obliged themselves to keep it in that Sense in which the Jews under the first Testament were bound to keep it, and their keeping of it was acceptable to God, and profitable to themselves.

2. Take the Law as misinterpreted and misunderstood by the Jews, *viz.* as tho it had been a Law through their meer keeping of which they should be saved, without the Mediation of Christ; (as it is evident they did so understand it) then I deny the Assumption, and affirm, that Circumcision never bound any Man so to keep the Law: and then the Apostle in arguing against Circumcision, deals with the *Galatians*, according to that false Notion of the Law they had imbibed from their false Teachers, and tells them, that in case they were circumcised, that is, as obliging themselves to the Law in the Sense now mentioned, they would

would be Debtors to do the whole Law, not only uprightly and ſincerely, but to do abſolutely all things written therein, ſeeing neither their Sacrifices nor Ceremonial Obſervations appointed in that Law, would yield them any Relief, in caſe of their failing to do all things written in the whole Law, and their returning and adhering to the Law in this ſenſe, would deprive them of any Benefit by Chriſt. And thus I judg we are to underſtand the Apoſtle in that place: So that take the Apoſtle's Senſe which way we will, the Argument is of no force. Take the Senſe the former way, then the Conſequence is unſound; if we take his Senſe the latter way, the Antecedent is falſe. And a greater Abſurdity can hardly be vented by Men, than to ſay, That God ever deſigned Circumciſion as an Obligation unto the Jews, thus to keep the Law, or any part of it. But,

3. His third Argument is this, *That which was always in compariſon of the Goſpel a weak and beggarly Element, was never a Goſpel-Ordinance; but Circumciſion was ſuch,* Ergo, *&c.*

Anſw. Here I ſhall poſitively deny the Conſequence in the *Major* Propoſition, and affirm, That that might be in the Apoſtle's Senſe ſaid to be a weak and beggarly Element; which yet, during the Firſt-Teſtament-Adminiſtration, might be a Goſpel-Ordinance. Will Mr. *G.* ſay, That the Jews had no Goſpel-Ordinances? Yet all their Ordinances come within the compaſs of theſe weak and beggarly Elements. Take it of the Paſſover, ſurely that was a Goſpel-

ſpel-Ordinance, and yet one of theſe weak and beggarly Elements.

But to haſten; As a cloſe of this, and to make way to what follows, I ſhall offer this one Argument to prove, That Circumciſion was a Goſpel-Ordinance, it is this, If Circumciſion was the Token of the Covenant of Grace, and as ſuch a Repreſentation and Seal to thoſe to whom it was applied of thoſe great Goſpel-Bleſſings, Righteouſneſs, Intereſt in God, and Sanctification, then it was a Goſpel-Ordinance; but the former is true, therefore the latter. I am aware Mr. *G.* will deny the Aſſumption; but I prove it thus, If that Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. be the Covenant of Grace, and Circumciſion was the Token of that Covenant, and, as ſuch, a Repreſentation and Seal to thoſe to whom it was applied, of thoſe forementioned Goſpel-Bleſſings, then it was a Goſpel-Ordinance.

The *Minor* or Aſſumption in both Arguments, conſiſts in two Branches; both which I know will be denied: But it is the former Branch that at preſent falls under our Conſideration, and ſuppoſing that be ſufficiently proved, the latter will hardly meet with any oppoſition. Now that being already demonſtrated, I ſhall at preſent add no more; only conſider what Mr. *G.* hath ſaid to prove the contrary, "That that "Covenant is not the Covenant of Grace, but "the Old Covenant, or that Covenant ſaid by "the Apoſtle to be *done away*; and this he ſaith "will appear three ways:

1. From the recital of the Covenant it ſelf.

2. From

2. From the Nature of Circumciſion; and chiefly becauſe the Covenant of Grace was not peculiar to *Abraham* and his Seed, but common to others, though they were not circumciſed.

He begins with the Firſt, and thus expreſſeth himſelf; "Whoſoever ſhall diligently read it, (that is, the Covenant recorded *Gen.* 17.4 to 15.) "will not find one word of the Promiſe of Bleſ-"ſedneſs to all Nations. So that it ſeems he doth not find in this Covenant, as there ſet down, any thing poſitive that makes it appear to be the Old Covenant, only Negatively he cannot find what he ſuppoſes ſhould have been in it. Had it been the Covenant of Grace, he cannot find one Word of the Promiſe of Bleſſedneſs to the Nations.

To which I ſay, 'Tis exceeding ſtrange. Are not the Promiſes of God's being a God to the Nations, yea and with them, to their Seed; and a Promiſe of Heaven included, and principally intended in the Promiſe of *Canaan*, Promiſes of Bleſſedneſs to the Nations? What can be called a Promiſe of Bleſſedneſs, if the one or the other of theſe be not ſo? See *Pſalm* 144. *ult.*

But it may be ſaid, Theſe Promiſes are not made to the Nations, but to *Abraham*'s Seed in their Generations.

To that I ſay, It is granted. But then let it be remembred, That in *Abraham*'s Seed, all that in or from among the Nations do believe in Chriſt are intended. So that here is an expreſs Promiſe of Bleſſedneſs to all Nations, upon condition of their Believing. And upon no other Terms is

that Promiſe, *Gen.* 12. at the beginning, made to the Nations, as Mr. *G.* himſelf acknowledges, *pag.* 4.

The Truth is, in that of *Gen.* 12. we have only a more general and indefinite Promiſe of Bleſſedneſs to the Nations, not expreſſing wherein that Bleſſedneſs ſhall conſiſt. But when God comes in a more expreſs and formal Way to eſtabliſh his Covenant with *Abraham*, as he doth in this *Gen.* 17. he not only promiſes Bleſſedneſs to the Nations upon their Believing, but particularly declares wherein that Bleſſedneſs ſhall conſiſt, and who among the Nations ſhall be the Subjects of it; and theſe are *Abraham*'s Seed in their Generations. Now then how any ſhould ſuppoſe that this is not the Covenant of Grace, becauſe of a ſuppoſed Defect in it of the Promiſe of Bleſſedneſs to the Nations, is to me unimaginable. But this is all that Mr. *G.* can find in the Covenant it ſelf, as a Reaſon inducing him to think it is not a Covenant of Grace, but muſt needs be the Old Covenant: Whereas the Reaſon why he cannot find what he looks after, is, becauſe he will not ſee it: and indeed none ſo blind as they that will not ſee.

2. He argues from the Subjects of this Covenant. And he argues thus; "If the Covenant of "Circumciſion had been the Covenant of "Grace, and Circumciſion the Sign of the Co"venant of Grace, then had all true Subjects of "it, as ſuch, been new Creatures in Chriſt Je"ſus: but the true or right Subjects of the Co"venant, (I ſuppoſe he means this Covenant) "and

"and Sign as ſuch, were not new Creatures in "Chriſt Jeſus.

Before I return an Anſwer to this Argument, I ſhall only ask Mr. *G.* this one Queſtion, and that is, Whether he judges, that to be a New Creature in Chriſt Jeſus, was indiſpenſably neceſſary to the Salvation of Men under the Firſt Teſtament? If he ſay it was, then I deny his *Minor* Propoſition, and affirm on the other hand, That all the true and right Subjects of this Covenant, (I mean of ſuch as were of ripe Years) ought to have been New Creatures, and then as ſuch had the Promiſes to them in their Generations, including their Infants with themſelves. If Mr. *G.* ſay it was not neceſſary, then I ſhall only ſay, Let him ſay what was neceſſary to their Salvation, the ſame was neceſſary to their Admiſſion into this Covenant, and having the Token of it applied unto them. But for a further Anſwer to this Argument, I ſhall refer the Reader to my Anſwer to Mr. *Danvers*, p. 98, & 117.

3. He argues from the Author of *Circumciſion.* And thus he conceives Circumſion could not "be a Goſpel-Ordinance, becauſe (as he thinks) "*Moſes* gave it as an Obligation to keep the Ce-"remonial Law.

Anſw. Mr. *G.* ſeems to be proving, That the Covenant of Circumciſion could not be the Covenant of Grace; but here he returns to prove, That Circumciſion was not a Goſpel-Ordinance. But let us ſee the Strength of his Reaſoning. He had before argued from the Obligations Circumciſion brought Men under to keep the

whole Law: So that the Strength of this Reason lies only in this, That it was given by *Moses*; and this he would prove from *John* 7. 22. where saith our Lord Christ, *Moses gave you Circumcision.* But let it be observed, that our Lord Christ himself qualifies that Assertion, and therefore immediately adds, *Not because*, or rather, as I judg, ὅτι there should be read; not that, or not as though Circumcision was of *Moses*; and so here is a plain denial that Circumcision was of *Moses.* And hence when our Lord Christ adds, *vers.* 23. *If any Man on the Sabbath receive Circumcision, that the Law of* Moses *should not be broken*; he seems evidently to deal with the Jews according to their own Sentiments about Circumcision. They looked upon it as appertaining to the Ceremonial Law; but saith Christ, *It was not of* Moses, *but of the Father.* However (for this is of no great Consideration) it is certain, Circumcision was long before *Moses:* It was given to *Abraham*, and that as the Token of the Covenant of Grace, and so might and did continue, although on the account of somewhat Ceremonial in it, it was inserted in the *Sinai*-Covenant; and answerably the Command was repeated by *Moses.* But for further satisfaction to this, see my Answer to Mr. *Cox*, p. 117. But,

4. There is yet one thing more that Mr. *G.* seems to lay great weight upon, and that is this; "That the Covenant of Grace was not peculiar to *Abraham* and his, but common to others, though they were not Circumcised. Which after he expresseth thus; "The Obliga-

"tion

"tion to be circumcised, was peculiar to *Abra-*
"*ham*, and to his Seed or Family, in such a
"sense, as none but they were obliged to be cir-
"cumcised.

But to that I would say, I grant, That the Covenant of Grace might be common to others, though they were not circumcised, as Mr. *G.* himself affirms. But yet I would willingly know, how far Mr. *G.* will extend that Term [*Family*], whether he only intends *Abraham*'s natural Lineage or Posterity; and so Seed and Family are of an equal extent. And if he thus understand that Term [*Family*], then how notoriously false his Assertion is, is obvious unto all. But if he extend it to all that were adopted into *Abraham*'s Family, as those bought with Mony, or born in his House, and the Proselites; how the restraining Circumcision to them should in the least intimate, and much less prove, That that Covenant was not the Covenant of Grace, nor Circumcision a Gospel-Ordinance, is impossible to imagine. But that which I suppose he drives at, is this, There were some in the Covenant of Grace which were not circumcised, nor under an Obligation to be circumcised. Now in Answer to this, I would only demand of Mr. *G.* Whether he is sure the Covenant now entred with *Abraham*, was so far promulgated, as that the Persons he talks of had knowledg of it? Or suppose they had some notice of it, Whether their Duty to be circumcised was made known unto them? Either of these things being granted, how their not being circumcised, should intimate that this Covenant is not the Covenant

of Grace, nor Circumcision a Gospel-Ordinance, is as much above the Reason of Man to apprehend as the former. I would commend to Mr. *G*. the Case of *Cornelius* in *Acts* 10. the latter end.

There is only one thing more that I would take notice of in Mr. *G*'s Discourse. And thus he argues against that Covenant, its being a Covenant of Grace, from the Date of the Promise. But I have returned so satisfactory an Answer to that in my Answer to Mr. *Cox*, that I shall add no more; see *p*. 97, and so on.

I shall now come to what Mr. *Cary* hath said in pursuance of the same Design, namely, to prove, That that Covenant, *Gen*. 17.7. is not the Covenant of Grace, but on the other hand, that it is the Old Covenant, or a Covenant of Works: only I shall premise, that at present I design not a full Answer of his Book; that I have already done in my Answer to Mr. *Cox*. Neither do I know how I could more effectually answer his Book, than by laying down and proving those three Propositions there laid down and proved.

I shall now only take notice of what is Argumentative in his Book, and considering the Commendation it hath by Five (as I suppose) of the chiefest of that Perswasion, and a Commendatory Epistle by a Sixth, I might justly expect something extraordinary; and I shall not deny but that my Expectations were somewhat high. But if ever that Proverb, *Parturiunt Montes*, were verified, it is here. Alas! what

what do I meet with but *Ridiculus Mus?* For I have yet obſerved but two Arguments ſyllogiſtically framed, by which he attempts the Confirmation of his Notion, and the very recital of them may, in the judgment of all unbyaſſed Perſons, be a ſufficient confutation of them.

The firſt is in his *p.* 120. and it is this; "If "that Covenant (he means that recorded in "*Gen.* 17.) was as much a Covenant of Works "as that Covenant of Mount *Sinai*, and that "Covenant mentioned *Dent.* 29. 9. nay, as "much as the Covenant made with *Adam* be"fore his Fall; then it is not a Covenant of "Grace: But it was as much a Covenant of "Works as either of the Covenants before"mentioned were; Therefore, *&c.*

A luſty Argument, if it would ſtand. But truly I might with ſorrow ſay, as the Apoſtle, of ſome, that would be teachers of the Law, *There are ſome that would be Teachers of the Goſpel, neither knowing what they ſay, nor whereof they affirm.* But to the Argument:

I poſitively deny the *Minor* Propoſition, as that concerns the Covenant made with *Adam*, and that entred with the People of *Iſrael* at Mount *Sinai*. As for that Covenant mentioned *Dent.* 29. 'tis the ſame with this in *Geneſis*, both which I affirm to be one and the ſame Covenant of Grace.

But Mr. *Cary* attempts to prove his *Minor* thus; "It muſt needs be as much a Covenant of "Works, as that entred with the People at "Mount *Sinai*, yea as that made with *Adam* in "Innocency; becauſe although God promiſed

"to be a God to *Abraham* and his Seed, yet it "was upon condition of Obedience, with an "answerable Threatning. But can Mr. *Cary*, or any other Man of common sense, think that the bare requiring of Obedience in any Covenant, or Threatning of Judgments in Case of Disobedience, makes it presently a Covenant of Works? Is it not expressly said, That *our Lord Christ is the Author of Salvation to all that obey him?* and doth he not say, *according to the Covenant of Grace?* Yea, and is not Faith it self an Act of Obedience, and yet the Condition of the Covenant of Grace? Mr. *G.* expressly grants that it is; and (if I do not mistake) so doth Mr. *Cary* also. And for Threatnings, doth not the Apostle tell us, *If we live after the Flesh, we shall die?* Rom. 8. 13. Yea, doth not our Lord Christ give us the Sum of the Gospel-Covenant, in his Commission to his Apostles, *Mark* 16. and yet doth he not say, *He that believeth not, shall be damned?* But not to waste time, Mr. *Cary* must know, that it is not the bare requiring of Obedience, nor yet the denouncing Threatnings, that makes a Covenant a Covenant of Works, but the commanding a perfect sinless Obedience to all that is written therein, and threatning Death unto all, in case of the least failure in such an Obedience. And therefore to proceed. His,

2. Argument, which is of a like validity with this, we have, *p.* 204. and it is this, "That "Covenant in which Faith was not reckoned to "*Abraham* for Righteousness, could never be a "Covenant of Faith, (of Grace I suppose he means).

means). And this Argument he takes to be irreſiſtible. Strange Confidence! And not to ſpend Time in ſhewing the Inſufficiency of his Proof, that ſpeaking of Circumciſion when his Argument ſpeaks of the Covenant; and ſure there is a wide difference between the Covenant, and Circumciſion the Token of it. So that this Argument of it ſelf falls to the ground for want of Proof. But yet let me ask this one Queſtion of Mr. *Cary*, and that is, Whether Faith was reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteouſneſs by a meer Act of Soveraign Grace, without Reſpect had to any Covenant he was then under? Or, was it reckoned to him by virtue of ſome Promiſe of any Covenant that he was then under? If he ſay the former, Then I ſhall only ſay, how his having his Faith reckoned unto him for Righteouſneſs, by ſuch an Act of Soveraign Grace, ſhould be an Argument that this Covenant after entred with him, was not the Covenant of Grace, is above the reach of Man's Underſtanding to apprehend. But if he ſay the latter, then I ſhall affirm, That was the Covenant of Grace; the ſame for ſubſtance with this now entred with him, only before leſs compleat, but now fully compleated: and how the Inſtitution of Circumciſion could either caſt *Abraham* out of it, or alter the Tenure of the Covenant, ſo as that before he had Faith reckoned to him for Righteouſneſs, by virtue of the Promiſes contained in it, but after neither had nor could have Faith alike reckoned to him for Righteouſneſs by virtue of the ſame Promiſes, is as much

above

above the Underſtanding of Man as the former.

We will ſuppoſe an *Heathen* or a *Pagan* converted and enabled to believe: Now upon his very firſt Converſion and Believing, he hath his Faith reckoned to him for Righteouſneſs; but afterwards this Man is baptized, ſhall we now ſay that the Covenant he is received into, and of which Baptiſm is a Sign or Seal, neither is nor can be the Covenant of Grace, becauſe he had his Faith reckoned to him for Righteouſneſs before his Baptiſm, or while in an unbaptized Condition; how abſurd would that be? So that this Argument is ſo far from being irreſiſtible, that it hath not the leaſt weight in it. But to proceed. Having removed out of our way theſe feeble Argumentations, whereby theſe two Authors endeavour to prove, That that Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. is not the Covenant of Grace, but the Covenant of Works, (the direct contrary whereunto I have affirmed) whereby the Arguments I have laid down for the Proof of my Aſſertion, may be rendred ſomewhat doubtful in the Judgments of Perſons of weaker Capacities, ſeeing Propoſitions lying ſo diametrically oppoſite the one to the other cannot both be true. I doubt not thoſe Arguments laid down by me will be ſeen in their full force.

And therefore I ſhall return to my firſt Deſign, which is (as I have ſaid) to direct to the laying a ſure Foundation to the Practice of Infant-Baptiſm in this Covenant eſtabliſhed between *God* and *Abraham*, and his Seed in their Generations.

2. The

2. The ſecond thing then to be done is, to determine the true and proper Subjects of this Covenant.

The firſt (as I have ſaid) is convincingly to prove, that it is indeed the Covenant of Grace, the very ſame Covenant under which Believers ſtill are.

2. The ſecond thing (I now ſay) is to determine the true and proper Subjects of it: And that they are and were *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations, the very words of the Covenant do aſſure us; for ſo the Covenant runs, *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations.* Here let it be obſerved, That it is not ſaid, *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed in thy Generations*, but *between me and thee, and thy Seed in their Generations, to be a God unto thee and thy Seed.* Now the Queſtion is, Who we are to underſtand by *Abraham*'s Seed? and who are intended and included in that Phraſe, *Their Generations?*

For the firſt, I anſwer, That by *Abraham*'s Seed, we are undoubtedly to underſtand all that in Scripture bare that Denomination of his Seed: And theſe are of two ſorts, 1. His Natural Seed. And, 2. His Spiritual Seed. All thoſe who through their taking hold of, and Reception into this Covenant, were, or are adopted into his Family, as the Proſelytes under the firſt Teſtament, and Believers under the New. As for Believers under the New Teſtament, (whom at preſent we are only concerned in) that they are to be accounted as *Abraham*'s

ham's Seed, is expreſly according to the Letter of the Scripture; *Rom.* 4. 16. *Gal.* 3. 29. Now I ſay, this Covenant God promiſeth to eſtabliſh between Himſelf and *Abraham*, and all his Seed, whether Natural or Spiritual: Here is no Exception of the one or the other kind of his Seed, but the words are abſolute, *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations:* And when God makes no Exception, we ought to make none.

2. But who are intended and included in this Clauſe [*Their Generations*]? Who are theſe Generations of *Abraham*'s Seed? To that I ſay, they are the natural Infants, or natural Seed of *Abraham*'s Seed. And that we are to underſtand the Infant-Seed naturally deſcending from this Seed of *Abraham*, I have (as I hope) ſufficiently proved formerly, and have as yet met with no Contradiction. And indeed, unleſs we include the Infant-Seed of *Abraham*'s Seed in that Clauſe, [*Their Generations*] there can be no Reaſon aſſigned of God's adding it; nor can it be interpreted in any other Senſe, in a Conſiſtency with the Truth and Faithfulneſs of God in his Covenant. But,

3. That which is to be done in purſuance of the End mentioned is, to ſettle and eſtabliſh the true Tenour of this Covenant, as here eſtabliſh'd between God and *Abraham*, and his Seed in their Generations. And for this we muſt obſerve that this Covenant, as here eſtabliſhed, may be conſidered two ways.

1. As having a more general Reſpect to all *Abraham*'s Seed.

2. As

2. As having a peculiar and ſpecial Reſpect to thoſe who heretofore did, or yet do ſtand immediately related to him as his Seed. Such were the Children immediately deſcended from his own Loins, as *Iſaac*, *Iſhmael*, &c. and ſuch are his Spiritual Seed, *viz.* Believers: they ſtand in as an immediate Relation to *Abraham*, as his Seed immediately deſcending from his own Loins did: And the Covenant, as eſtabliſhed with theſe, gives them a preſent actual Right to, and Intereſt in the Good promiſed in it. And for the more clear underſtanding the true Tenour of this Covenant, theſe three things muſt be obſerved.

1. That the Covenant was and is eſtabliſhed between God and all theſe his immediate Seed, univerſally one as well as the other. That it was ſo eſtabliſhed between God and *Abraham*'s natural Seed, I have fully proved; and that it is ſo eſtabliſhed between God and his Spiritual Seed, will certainly be readily granted by all that lay claim to this Spiritual Relation unto *Abraham*.

2. That it was and is eſtabliſhed between God and every one of theſe that were or are the Seed of *Abraham* in their Generations, including (as I ſaid) their Infant-Seed with their Parents, between God and whomſoever this Covenant hath been eſtabliſhed, it always hath been, and is eſtabliſhed between him and them in their Generations: this is according to the expreſs words of the Covenant: So that ſuppoſing it to be granted (as I judg it is paſs'd all rational Contradiction proved) that in that Clauſe

[*Their Generations*] the natural Infants of *Abraham*'s Seed are included, it muſt be granted, that all the Infant-Seed of Believers are (as ſuch) in Covenant with God, and anſwerably have a preſent Right and Title to the Good promiſed in it.

3. That this Covenant indiſpenſably requires a perſonal Acceptation of, and Cloſure with it, by all between God and whom it hath been or is eſtabliſhed. As for grown Perſons, their firſt Admiſſion into it doth indiſpenſably require it: as for Infants, whether naturally deſcended from *Abraham*, or from his Seed, ſuch a perſonal Acceptation of and a Cloſure with it, always hath been and is indiſpenſably required upon their coming to Years of Diſcretion, and thereby they did and do become *Abraham*'s Spiritual Seed; and as ſuch convey Covenant-Intereſt to their Seed. And from theſe three things we may infer theſe two Colloraries.

1. That all *Abraham*'s natural Poſterity immediately or mediately deſcending from him, did, as grown up to Years of Diſcretion, hold their Intereſt in the Covenant, and Right to the Good promiſed, not as his Natural Seed, but as his Spiritual Seed. And the like muſt be ſaid of Believers Seed, I mean of ſuch who have their Covenant-Intereſt continued to them.

2. That however the Covenant might have a more general Reſpect to all *Abraham*'s Natural Seed mediately deſcended from him, yet none of them could merely as his Natural Seed, lay a juſt Title to the Covenant, nor did the Cove-

Covenant secure to them any part of that Good contained in it. Their Parents failing to take hold of the Covenant, did forfeit both their own and their Childrens Interest; the like is still true under the New Testament.

4. In pursuance of the same Design, the Terms of the Covenant including both the Stipulations or Promises made on God's part, and the Restipulation or Duty required of those with whom it is made. And this Stipulation on God's part in the general consists in these two Promises:

1. That he would be a God to them. And,

2. That he would give them the Land of *Canaan*, including and principally intending the Heavenly Inheritance, *viz.* Heaven it self. So that whosoever God doth enter this Covenant with, as he engages himself to be a God to them, so to give them the Land of *Canaan*, either literal *Canaan*, or the Heavenly Inheritance typified thereby. And hence these Promises being made both to *Abraham* and all his Seed in their Generations, including both Parents and Children, it sufficiently appears, that the Good, or the Benefits and Blessings accrewing to Infants by their Covenant-Interest, are vastly more than meerly Nominal, as Mr. *Cary* will still needs suppose them to be. But see my Essay, *p.* 99, to 163.

2. The Restipulation on the part of those with whom this Covenant is entred in the general is, that they keep the Covenant, so *Gen.* 17. 9. And for a more clear understanding of this, and the improvement of it to the End men-

mentioned, theſe four things muſt be carefully obſerved.

1. That by *Keeping* the Covenant is firſtly intended, the Application of the Token, Sign or Seal of the Covenant, and that as obliging to the performance of the whole of what God requires of thoſe 'tis entred with. *Token*, here we muſt not take abſtractly in it ſelf, but including its Uſe and End. And hence,

2. Under this Command, *To keep the Covenant*, is required the performance of all that Duty ſpecified in the Covenant, according to the Capacity of the Subjects of it.

3. That this Command, as more generally laid down, obligeth all the Subjects of the Covenant univerſally: and anſwerably as it obligeth Parents, ſo their Seed; as it obligeth all them taken into Covenant under the firſt Teſtament, whether of *Abraham*'s Natural Seed, or Proſelytes, always including Parents and Children, ſo it ſtill obligeth *Abraham*'s Spiritual Seed, *viz.* Believers, ſtill including Parents and Children. And hence,

4. We muſt neceſſarily diſtinguiſh between this Command as more generally expreſs'd, and the Deſignation of the Token to be kept. The Command is abſolute, and extends to all *Abraham*'s Seed in their Generations, and being never repealed, muſt needs extend to Believers under the New Teſtament, and that in their Generations, that is, both Parents and Children: So that tho there hath been an alteration in the Token of the Covenant, it was formerly Circum-

Circumciſion, but now Baptiſm, yet the Command is the ſame, that ſtill abides in its full force; and anſwerably here we have an expreſs Command for the Baptiſm of the Infant-Seed of Believers, tho not *eo nomine* as Baptiſm, yet as the Token of the Covenant: as take the Command abſtractly by it ſelf (as we ought to do) it did not require Circumciſion *eo nomine* as Circumciſion, but as the Token of the Covenant. God firſt gives out a Command to keep his Covenant, intending, though not only, yet primarily, the Token of it; and as ſo given out, it obligeth all *Abraham*'s Seed in their Generations, whether thoſe under the firſt, or Believers under the ſecond Teſtament: and then he ſpecifies what ſhould then be the Token of it, and that was Circumciſion. But when our Lord Chriſt comes in the Fleſh, he lays aſide that Token, and intimates another, which is Baptiſm: but the Command to keep the Covenant, as abſtractly taken, abides in its force throughout all Ages. This indeed our Oppoſers ſeem unwilling to underſtand: but let things be ſeriouſly and impartially weigh'd, and Truth will appear and prevail.

Laſtly; In purſuance of this Deſign, the Scriptures muſt be throughly ſearch'd, and whatever is found in them for the further Diſcovery, and aſſuring us of the Mind and Will of our Lord Chriſt, relating to the Practice under Conſideration, muſt be taken in, and improved for this End and Purpoſe. The full Mind and Will of our Lord Chriſt is not held forth in a ſingle Scripture, or in any

part of the Scriptures, but the Revelations of it lie ſcattered throughout the whole Scriptures; and whoever will make a thorow and impartial ſearch, they will find much, poſſibly much more than yet hath been brought to light, clearly manifeſting and aſſuring us, that this is indeed his Mind and Will, *viz.* That the Infant-Seed of Believers, as taken into the ſame Covenant with their Parents, ſhould be baptized. Thoſe that ſee meet, may peruſe what I have written of this import in thoſe ſmall Tracts, here referred to. And to ſum up all in brief, If any Man ask me what Warrant I have to baptize the Infant-Seed of Believers? they may take it thus:

1. I find that that Covenant recorded *Gen.* 17. 7. was a Covenant of Grace, the very ſame Covenant under which the Church and People of God ever ſince have been and ſtill are. This to me is paſt all rational Contradiction.

2. I find that God did eſtabliſh this Covenant between himſelf and *Abraham*, and his Seed in their Generations.

3. I find that in this Clauſe [*Their Generations*] the Infant-Seed of *Abraham*'s Seed were and are univerſally included.

4. I find that this Covenant, as actually conveying a preſent Intereſt in, and Right to the Good contained in it, did only extend to *Abraham*'s immediate Seed, whether thoſe naturally deſcended from him, or thoſe who became his Seed by taking hold of the Covenant, and anſwerably that all his mediate Seed held their Intereſt

rereſt in the Covenant, not as his Natural (tho many of them were ſo) but as his Spiritual Seed; as having perſonally taken hold of the Covenant themſelves. And,

5. I find that this Covenant was always entred with *Abraham*'s Seed, whether Natural or Spiritual, in their Generations, including their Infants with the Parents. It was ſo during the Firſt-Teſtament-Adminiſtration, and anſwerably muſt needs be alike ſo under the New.

6. I find that God did expreſly command, that both *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations, ſhould keep this Covenant, intending thereby, tho more, yet firſtly, that they ſhould obſerve and apply the Token of it, as Parents ſhould have it applied to themſelves, ſo that they ſhould take care that it be applied to their Children as Joint-Heirs of the Promiſes with themſelves.

7. I find that Baptiſm is the preſent Token of the Covenant; and conſequently is the Token now to be applied by virtue of that Command, obliging all *Abraham*'s Seed in their Generations to keep the Covenant. And,

Laſtly, I find variety of other Scriptures fully aſſuring me, that I do rightly underſtand his Mind and Will as thus revealed in his firſt eſtabliſhing this Covenant with *Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful, and his Seed in their Generations. And from the whole, I would now ask, Where are thoſe far-fetch'd Conſequences that our Oppoſers talk of, that we are forced to make uſe of for the Proof of

Infant-Baptiſm? Let but *Abraham*'s Covenant be rightly underſtood, taking in all other Scriptures confirming the Practice we plead for, and here will be found no other Conſequences, than what are neceſſary to a right Uſe and Improvement of any Command or Promiſe whatſoever contained in the Scriptures: And what ſhould hinder then, but that this Controverſy at laſt ſhould come to a Period?

I have only further to touch in brief upon a Sheet of Paper lately come forth, in oppoſition to the Practice of Infant-Baptiſm, by an *Anonymous* Author; the deſire of ſome that I ſhould return an Anſwer unto which, hath occaſioned the foregoing Pages. Who the Author is, I have as yet no intimation: I ſhall only ſay, That if he be one that hath aſſumed the Work of a Teacher among the Men of his Perſwaſion, he hath done prudently in concealing his Name; but if he be a private Member of any of their Congregations, (as I ſuppoſe he may be) he might have made himſelf known. For who will expect from any, more than they have received, or might juſtly be expected to have attained to? He ſeems to be (and I hope is) one of thoſe for whom I have heartily wiſhed that they had a greater ſhare in thoſe Abilities, that ſome of that Perſwaſion have attained to. But (be he who he will) he attempts to prove theſe two things:

1. "That Baptiſm ought to be adminiſtred "univerſally, by Dipping or Plunging the whole "Body under Water.

2. That

2. "That grown Perſons profeſſing their "Faith and Repentance, are the only true Sub- "jects of Baptiſm.

As to the firſt, I ſhall ſay but little, did not he, or any other of his Perſwaſion, make that manner of Baptizing ſimply and abſolutely neceſſary to the Truth and Validity of that Ordinance, and annul it when otherwiſe adminiſtred, they ſhould meet with little oppoſition from me. I doubt not but Baptiſm, as ſo adminiſtred, is true Baptiſm, and was (at leaſt ſometime) ſo adminiſtred in Primitive Times, and a conſiderable Time after; but that our Lord Chriſt doth indiſpenſably require it to be ſo adminiſtred univerſally, that I deny: and doubt not but that Baptiſm adminiſtred, either by pouring Water on, or waſhing the Face with Water, yea, or ſprinkling Water upon the Face, ſuppoſing the right Form of Baptiſm to be obſerved, is true Baptiſm, and valid to all its Ends and Purpoſes, and need not be repeated: and I judg that our Lord Chriſt expreſſeth Baptiſm by a Word that will admit of a different manner of adminiſtring it. But for this I ſhall refer this good Man, and all others that deſire Satisfaction, to my Anſwer to Mr. *Danvers*, pag. 143, to the end. All that he hath added to what others have ſaid, is an Obſervation he hath made, that in the *Dutch* Teſtament, *John* the *Baptiſt* is called *John the Dooper*. But of how little Conſideration that is, is obvious unto all: The utmoſt that can be made of it is only this, That one Man, or at leaſt very few that tranſlated the Bible into *Dutch*, judged it beſt ſo to

render the word Ιωάννης ὁ Βαπτιστὴς, and what ſignifieth the Judgment of One, or a few Men? Suppoſe our *Engliſh* Tranſlators had rendred it *John the Waſher*, (as they might have done) would this Man have taken their Tranſlation as a certain Determination of this Controverſy? But I ſhall refer the Reader to the Place mentioned: as alſo to Mr. *Walker*'s Treatiſe of this Subject, the beſt that I judg is extant. And if any be yet unſatisfied, they have the liberty from me to act according to the Light they have received, provided they do not plead the Manner of Adminiſtring that Ordinance againſt the dueneſs of Infant-Baptiſm. The Manner of adminiſtring that Ordinance, concerns not the Subjects of it. Whence it is moſt unreaſonable and abſurd to plead the Manner of Adminiſtring Baptiſm againſt our Practice. Let the Subjects be determined, and let every one act according to his own Light in the Manner of Adminiſtring that Ordinance.

But to proceed; The other Thing that he attempts to prove, is, "That only grown Per-"ſons, profeſſing Faith and Repentance, are the "true Subjects of Baptiſm.

And as for this I ſhall not ſay much: Thoſe that will impartially peruſe and weigh what I have already ſaid, (they imitating the Noble *Bereans*, Acts 17.) will (as I judg) ſee it wholly needleſs. Indeed, for ſuch as Mr. *Grantham*, who cannot ſee Bleſſedneſs promiſed to the Nations in that Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. I ſhall deſpair of their diſcerning the Mind and Will of our Lord Chriſt contended about, though appearing

pearing in the cleareſt Noon-Light of Divine Revelations. But for thoſe who have Eyes to ſee Truth when brought to Light, I ſhall not be ſo uncharitable to ſuppoſe, that what this Honeſt Man hath ſaid, will raiſe the leaſt Heſitations in their Minds about the Intereſt of the Infant-Seed of Believers in the Covenant, or their Right to Baptiſm on the account of that their Intereſt. But yet let us take a brief view of what he hath ſaid to prove his Aſſertion. And he attempts to prove it three ways.

1. From Scripture.

2. By Reaſon grounded upon Scripture.

3. From certain Abſurdities which he ſuppoſes will follow upon our Practice.

1. For Scripture. And thus he would prove his Aſſertion two ways.

1. From the Scriptures recording the Baptiſm of grown Perſons, without making mention of the Baptiſm of their Infants. And he Inſtances in thoſe that were baptized by *John Baptiſt*, the Diſciples of Chriſt, and *Philip*. To which I will ſay only two Things.

1. Suppoſing that ſome of them had Infants, How doth our Author know but that they were baptized, though the Scripture records it not? We find no record of the Apoſtles Baptiſm, and yet undoubtedly they were baptized. But,

2. Suppoſe that they had Infants, and they were not Baptized, that doth not at all prejudice the Cauſe of Pædobaptiſm. For let it be conſidered that all theſe, excepting the Eunuch, who undoubtedly then had no Infants, at leaſt

with him, whoſe Baptiſm we have now reſpect unto, their Infants as well as themſelves had been before circumciſed: and the Parents might, and it was neceſſary they ſhould be baptized, but their Children might not, neither was it neceſſary that they ſhould, having already the Token of the Covenant applied to them, which as yet was not laid aſide.

But it may be ſaid, So had their Parents. But to that I ſay, 'Twas neceſſary that their Parents ſhould be Baptized, as an Obligation to, and whereby they did in a ſpecial manner viſibly own and acknowledg, That that very Perſon, *viz.* Jeſus Chriſt, was the true Meſſias promiſed to their Fathers. Hence it is no way abſurd, nor the leaſt prejudice to the Cauſe of Infant-Baptiſm, to grant, that none of the Infant-Seed of believing Jews, till the abſolute abrogation, and laying aſide of Circumciſion, was publiſhed and fully made known to the Church, were baptized: But now after the Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of Chriſt, when Circumciſion was wholly laid aſide, we ſtill find when Parents were Baptized, their Houſholds, peculiarly including their Children, were Baptized with them. But it may be our Author will ſay, he doth not argue meerly from the Scriptures not mentioning the Baptiſm of Infants, but from that taken in Conjunction with *John*'s Preaching Repentance, and Chriſt's making Diſciples by teaching them, and the Apoſtles requiring Faith of thoſe that they Baptized. But to that I Anſwer; Both *John Baptiſt*, our Lord, and the Apoſtles, having to do with grown Perſons, they did

did, and it was neceſſary they ſhould preach Repentance, teach and inſtruct them before they baptized them, and upon their profeſſing their Faith and Repentance, adminiſter that Ordinance to them: But what is that to Infants? They might have, and had, by virtue of their Parents Faith, an Intereſt in the Covenant, and upon that account had a right to Baptiſm, which when Circumciſion was laid aſide, and Baptiſm inſtituted, was applied to them. But,

2. He would prove his Aſſertion from the Commiſſion given by our Lord Chriſt to his Apoſtles. But to that, having ſo fully proved that the Commiſſion doth not exclude, but on the other hand include Infants, ſuppoſing their Intereſt in the Covenant, and yet the fitneſs and meetneſs of our Lord Chriſt's expreſſing the Commiſſion as he hath done, that it is wholly ſuperfluous to add any thing more. See my *Plain Proof of Infant-Baptiſm*, p. 73. as alſo my Anſwer to Mr. *Danvers*, Chap. 2. p. 25. and therefore ſhall proceed.

Our Author offers two Reaſons why Baptiſm is by Dipping, Waſhing, or burying the Body all over in Water, only to Believers upon a profeſſion of their Faith and Repentance.

1. "That it is the Poſitive Law and Soveraign "Will and Pleaſure of God.

In Anſwer to which: As to the Manner of Adminiſtring Baptiſm, which his two Reaſons ſeem to have a peculiar reſpect unto, having ſpoken to that already, I ſhall add no more, but take his Reaſons as reſpecting the Subjects of Baptiſm; and as to this Firſt I ſay, in a direct Oppoſition

Oppoſition to what he ſaith, That it is not the poſitive Will or Pleaſure of God, that Believers only ſhould be baptized, but it is alike his poſitive Will and Pleaſure that their Infants ſhould be baptized with them. This I have fully proved, which I refer him unto; and proceed to his

Second Reaſon, and that is taken from two Ends of Baptiſm.

To which I ſay, that there are other Ends of Baptiſm, with reference to which it is the Will and Pleaſure of God that it ſhould be applied to Infants. To inſtance only in theſe two:

1. That by it they may be by a ſolemn Right or Ordinance of his own Inſtitution, dedicated, given up, and engaged unto God in Chriſt.

2. That in and by it, the Benefits and Bleſſings of the Covenant may be repreſented and ſignified, and the Promiſes wherein they are contained, ratified and confirmed, both to Parents and Children, which when they come to Years of Maturity, they are to improve, as to encourage, ſo to engage themſelves perſonally to cloſe in with the Covenant, and give up themſelves to God in Chriſt, according to the Tenour of it; and thereupon ſtrengthen and confirm their Faith in a believing Application of the Promiſes to themſelves. Hence what he ſaith of all Worſhip, which he ſaith is not commanded by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in his Holy Word, is vain Worſhip, *&c.* It concerns not us, ſeeing we affirm it is according to the Will of God revealed in his Word, That Infants ſhould be baptized. But,

3. He

3. He argues from certain Abſurdities, which (as he ſuppoſes) will follow upon our Practice. Of which I muſt ſay in the General, that they are all mere Miſtakes and Scare-Crows, the Effects of a clouded Fancy. As,

1. That we go to *Moſes* for an Inſtitution of Baptiſm. When as we go not to *Moſes*, but to the Covenant of Grace eſtabliſhed with our Father *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations, and confirmed of *God* in Chriſt, 430 Years before the Law was given by *Moſes*. For his Second, *viz.*

2. That our Practice lays a Foundation for a National Church: 'Tis ſtill a groſs Miſtake. 'Tis well known that there are in *England*, and *New-England*, who plead for and live in the Practice of Congregational Churches, and yet maintain the Doctrine and Practice of Infant-Baptiſm, and that in a perfect conſiſtency with their Principles and Practice. For the Third, *viz.*

3. That it affirmeth the Children of Believers, were by Virtue of their Parents Faith in the Covenant of Grace, united or ingrafted into Chriſt, contrary to *Eph.* 2.

But that our Practice ſhould contradict the Apoſtle, in that *Eph.* 2. where all are ſaid *to be Children of Wrath*, which are the Words, I ſuppoſe, he hath reference to; ſuppoſing our Principles rightly underſtood, is unimaginable. Yea, it is becauſe we believe them to be Children of Wrath as well as others, that we ſo earneſtly contend for their Covenant-Intereſt, and the Dueneſs of their Baptiſm up

on the Account thereof. They may be, and are, Children of Wrath by Nature, as having ſinned in *Adam*, and being ſhapen in Iniquity, and conceived in Sin; and yet upon their Birth into the World, be, as the Seed of Believing Parents, taken with their Parents into the Covenant of Grace; and hereupon have a Right to be implanted into Chriſt's Myſtical Body, whereby they are ſecured, during their pure Infant-State, from the Effects of that Wrath they were by Nature the Children of: And who can aſſign any ſhew of Reaſon, why it may not be ſo? They are not the Children of Wrath, and in the Covenant of Grace, at one and the ſame inſtant of Time: their State, as Children of Wrath, precedes their State, as in Covenant with God.

4. As for the Fourth Abſurdity, it's deceiving of Souls; I ſhall only ſay, That if any ſuch thing doth happen, 'tis from the ignorance or neglect of Parents, or thoſe that ſhould inſtruct them. We only affirm, That their Covenant-State ſecures them from the Effects of Wrath during their pure Infancy. The Covenant indiſpenſably requiring their perſonal Faith and Repentance, when they come to Years capacifying them to Believe and Repent. And what Deceit is here put upon any? For his

Laſt Abſurdity, that ſtill is but his own Fancy, proceeding from his Ignorance of the true Doctrine of Infants Covenant-Intereſt and Baptiſm. Will he but peruſe what I have written in my *Eſſay*, p. 143. *&c.* he may ſee this

Abſurdity

Abſurdity fully removed out of his Way. But,

Laſtly, This Our Brother (for ſo I ſhall own him) comes to anſwer ſome Objections againſt what he hath ſaid.

1. As for that Objection he raiſeth from what we are taught concerning the Doctrine of Baptiſm in the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, not being concerned in it, I ſhall ſay nothing to it. But for his,

2 *Object.* I ſhall briefly touch upon that, and haſten to a cloſe. 'Tis raiſed from the Pleas we make for Infant-Baptiſm, from the Covenant made with *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations. And as a Reply to what he ſaith in Anſwer to this Objection, or theſe Objections: he pretends to anſwer Two Objections, the One raiſed from *Acts* 2. 38. the Other from *Gen.* 17. 7. But they may be reduced into One. I ſhall referr him, and all others, to what I have written, to ſhew the Sureneſs of the Foundation laid in this Covenant entred with *Abraham* for the Practice of Infant-Baptiſm, a Summary of which may be ſeen in the fore-going Pages: and ſhall only take notice of what he ſaith of a Covenant of Election, unto which both *Abraham*, before he was called, and alſo many Children, both of Believers and of Unbelievers, did belong. But as to that I ſay, That a Covenant of Election is a meer *Chimæra*: there is no ſuch thing revealed in the Scriptures. That there is an Election of Grace, the Apoſtle is expreſs; but of a Covenant-Election we

we find not the leaſt mention throughout the Scriptures: and poſſibly our Author means no more than what we affirm. Which if it be ſo, I ſhall let the Unſcripturalneſs of his Expreſſion paſs: but ſhall affirm, That none, whether Old or Young, ever were, are, or ſhall be (ſo far as is revealed unto us) ſaved meerly by virtue of their Election. I ſhall not determine what Reſerves God hath kept ſecret in his own Breaſt concerning the Salvation of Infants deſcending from wicked Parents, whether Heathens or nominal Chriſtians: Secret things belong unto God. Neither doth the Caſe of ſuch Infants at all concern the preſent Controverſy. But this I ſay, According to what is revealed in the Scriptures, None ever were, are, or ſhall be ſaved by virtue meerly of their Election; but all that are ſaved (ſo far as God hath revealed unto us) muſt be, and are ſaved by Virtue, and according to the Tenour of the Covenant of Grace, *viz.* This Covenant eſtabliſhed with *Abraham* as the Father of the Faithful, and his Seed in their Generations. Hence I ſhall aver (how cruel ſoever I may be judged to be by Mr. *Grantham*), That no Unbeliever can, according to any Divine Revelation, have any aſſured Hope, either of their own, or of their Childrens Salvation who die in their Infancy. But this is a Controverſy excentrical to my preſent Deſign, neither do I deſire to engage in it. This I am ſatisfied in, That all the Seed of Believers, at leaſt that do own their Childrens Covenant-

venant-Intereſt, and do not, out of contempt to the Ordinance of God, neglect their Baptiſm, are infallibly ſaved (if they die in Infancy); as for others, let the Day declare it. As for him that will undertake to reprove God, in caſe he do not ſave all Infants, I ſhall only ſay as God himſelf doth in a like Caſe, *Let him anſwer it.*

But to have done. As for what our Author enlargeth upon that Suppoſition, That that Covenant entred with *Abraham*, was the Old Covenant, it is utterly inſignificant, ſeeing I have ſo fully proved, That that Covenant is not the Old Covenant, nor had any Relation to it, but indeed is the Covenant of Grace, that Covenant-Believers are ſtill under, and therefore I have no Reaſon to take any notice of it.

As for what he ſaith in Anſwer to that Queſtion, Whether Baptiſm came in the Room or ſtead of Circumciſion? It is enough for us, that Baptiſm is the Token or Seal of the Covenant; (which our Author acknowledges,) and anſwerably doth correſpond with, and come in the ſtead of Circumciſion, in the General Notion of it, *viz.* as the Token of the Covenant. Hence whatever other Differences may be aſſigned, they concern not this Controverſy.

I have only this to deſire of this good Man, That he will be perſwaded that he hath not as yet looked half the way into this Controverſy. And ſhall add, that if any will yet agitate this Controverſy, I earneſtly beg of them

them to do it, so as to approve themselves unto him that searcheth their Hearts, and is ready to judg the Quick and the Dead, and shew themselves to be Men.

FINIS.

The Author hath published these Treatises also about this Subject, viz.

1. INfant Baptism from Heaven, and not of Men; or a moderate Discourse concerning the Baptism of the Infant-Seed of Believers.

2. Infant-Baptism from Heaven, and not of Men, the 2*d* Part: Or an Answer to *Mr. Danvers*'s Treatise of Baptism. Wherein Infants Right to Baptism is further confirmed.

3. An Essay to revive the Primitive Doctrine and Practice of Infant-Baptism, in the Resolution of Four Questions. 1. What are the Reasons of God's appointing the Token of his Covenant to be applied to the Infant-Seed of his People. 2. What is the Good or Benefit they receive thereby. 3. What is the Duty of Parents towards their Children, as bearing the Token of the Covenant. 4. What is the Improvement that Children, as grown up to Years of Maturity, may and ought to make of the Token as applied to them in their Infancy.

4. Infant-Baptism plainly proved. A Discourse wherein certain Select Arguments for Infant-Baptism, formerly syllogistically handled, are now abbreviated, and reduced to a plain Method for the Benefit of the Unlearned. With a large Epistle to the Pious and Learned among the *Antipædobaptists*, especially the Authors of the late Confession of their Faith.

5. A brief Discourse concerning Man's natural proneness to, and tenaciousness of Errors. Whereunto are added, some Arguments to prove, That that Covenant entred with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7. is the Covenant of Grace.

All sold by Jonathan Robinson *at the Golden-Lion in St.* Paul's *Church-Yard. Together with several other Treatises in Defence of Infant-Baptism, by Mr.* Baxter, *Mr.* Wills, *Mr.* Barret, *&c.*

A POSTSCRIPT:

Being a further Defence of INFANT-BAPTISM, *againſt Mr.* Keach.

WHEN the foregoing Sheets were juſt wrought off the Preſs, a little Tract came to my hand, put forth by Mr. *Benjamin Keach*, one of the Epiſtolers to Mr. *Cary*'s Book, which I have peruſed; and although I find not my ſelf, in the way wherein I have proceeded, farther proof of Infant-Baptiſm much concerned; neither do I fear but that any who ſhall truly weigh what I have written, will ſee what he hath ſaid is ſufficiently obviated, and therefore I might well, and at firſt view of his Book, have thought to have let it paſs without taking any notice of it. Yet becauſe it is poſſible ſomething that he hath ſuggeſted, or rather repeated from others, may ſomewhat obſtruct Perſons of weaker Capacities, in their compliance with that Practice I have pleaded for; I have, upon ſecond thoughts, judged it meet to conſider what he hath written, ſo far as I conceive neceſſary; for I would not willingly leave any thing behind me unremoved out of the way of the weakeſt of ſincere Chriſtians, complying with the Mind and Will of our Lord Chriſt, in reference unto that practice wherein his Intereſt and Kingdom, the Glory of God, the Good of Children, and the Comfort of their Parents, is ſo nearly con-

cerned; and the rather, becauſe our Lord Chriſt ſeems in a ſpecial manner to have allotted me, with ſome others, the maintaining of this Province: And it may not be unuſeful, at leaſt to Mr. *Keach* himſelf, to remark ſome few things in the general, before I come to a particular conſideration of what he hath ſaid; and,

Firſt, It may be remarkable how confident he is, when the Grounds he proceeds upon are ſo ſlight and trivial, and which have been afore fully removed, giving us too much ground to ſuſpect, he hath as yet looked but a very little way into this Controverſy. How ſlight and trivial his Grounds are, and where he might have ſeen them before removed, ſhall be ſhewed after. Yet ſee how he expreſſes himſelf, *pag.*65. in an *Apoſtrophe* to our Lord Chriſt; "Lord, "ſays he, that Man ſhould be ſo bold and pre-"ſumptuous, as once to attempt to alter or change "any thing (he hath reſpect unto the Subject of "Baptiſm) of this Holy or great Commiſſion, "or adventure to do things contrary to what "is given forth here by Jeſus Chriſt, as King "and Lawgiver of the New Teſtament. When he might, and it is ſomewhat hard for me to perſwade my ſelf, that he hath not ſeen it fully proved, that in the Pleas we make for Infant-Baptiſm, we make not the leaſt alteration or change in that Commiſſion, but affirm that it was neceſſary, that although it be the Will of Chriſt that Infants ſhould be baptized, yet he ſhould expreſs himſelf therein as he hath done. I ſhall only ſay at preſent, it's eaſy, and not unuſual for Men, Cynick-like, by crying out of

others

other's ſuppoſed Evils, to diſcover the ſame more prevailing in themſelves.

Secondly, It may be remarked, how partial he is in his own Cauſe; it appears that he takes it for granted, as indeed we all do, that Chriſt hath Power to preſerve, protect, and uphold all grown Perſons, in their being Baptized by Dipping or Plunging, how aged, weak, and infirm ſoever they are, and that in the coldeſt Climates, and ſharpeſt Seaſons; and he would perſwade himſelf, yea, is very confident, none ever received the leaſt hurt or damage by being ſo baptiz'd, (yea, he concludes, as he may juſtly do, That our Lord Chriſt would not inſtitute any Ordinance to deſtroy the Lives of any Perſon) thus *pag.* 66. and yet he pleads it as an Evidence, "That Infants cannot be the Sub-"jects of Baptiſm, becauſe their tender Bodies "cannot bear it in theſe cold Climates without "palpable danger of their lives. And tells us again, "That Chriſt never appointed any Or-"dinance to deſtroy the lives of any of his "Creatures; thus Page the 4*th* of his Epiſtle, and 32*d* of his Book. But let me ſay, Why cannot Jeſus Chriſt preſerve, protect, and uphold Infants, as well as grown Perſons, whoſe Age, Weakneſs, and Infirmities, in conjunction with the tender and delicate way and manner of living, renders their Bodies alike tender as, if not more tender than the Bodies of Infants, and whoſe Baptiſm by Immerſion would as palpably indanger their lives, as the Immerſion of Infants would indanger theirs. But it ſeems, in the conceit of our Author, that is an

Argument againſt the Subjects of Baptiſm, which is none againſt the manner of baptizing, whenas the thing it ſelf is indeed as ſtrong an Argument againſt the one, as againſt the other: And for mine own part, were there a neceſſity of Baptiſm by Immerſion, I could as eaſily truſt our Lord Chriſt with the preſerving the lives of Infants, as of grown Perſons, *viz.* ſuch as thoſe aforementioned: But our Author here gives as a hint why they ſo zealouſly plead for baptizing by Immerſion, it is, that they might exclude Infants from Baptiſm.

Thirdly, I cannot but remark Mr. *Keach* his great diſingenuity, (that is the mildeſt term I can give it) for indeed 'tis very bad, exceeding bad, and a very great diſparagement, both to himſelf and his Cauſe. I ſhall only give a two-fold Inſtance: Firſt, in his quoting Mr. *Baxter*, and other Pædobaptiſt Aſſertions, concerning the Uſe and End of Baptiſm, and the Qualifications of the Subjects to be baptized, as though they were contradictory unto their practice; whereas what they ſay, is indeed no way contradictory thereunto, but fully conſiſtent therewith; and in particular, as for Mr. *Baxter*, he hath fully vindicated himſelf, which yet Mr. *Keach* hath the ingenuity to take no notice of: And it is certain, the Uſe and End of Baptiſm are not ſuch, but that it may be fitly applied to Infants; and how unreaſonable and abſurd is it to conclude, that becauſe ſuch and ſuch Qualifications are required in the Adult, therefore Infants are not to be baptized? that there were certain Qualifications required in the

Adult

Adult Heathens to their Circumciſion which their Infants were uncapable of yet, and that their Infants were circumciſed with them, is undeniable. Now ſuppoſe any of the Prieſts or Levites, whoſe Lips were, as the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaks, to preſerve Knowledg, ſhould preach or write of thoſe Qualifications; for any from thence to conclude againſt the circumciſing their Infants, how abſurd would it be? It may be our Author will ſay, they had an expreſs Command for their Circumciſion. To which I anſwer, It is granted, aud we affirm that we have, if not an expreſs Command, yet that which is equivolent thereunto, for the baptizing of Infants: of which more immediately.

2*ly.* Our Author's Diſingenuity appears in his frequent Citations out of Mr. *Danvers* Book (a Book of which it muſt be ſaid, it hath been and for ever will be a Reproach to the Cauſe it pleads; and I cannot but hope himſelf hath repented, as others of that Perſwaſion are aſhamed of it) without taking notice of the Anſwers long ſince returned unto it; yea, ſuch is the Diſingenuity of our Author, that he cites ſome Teſtimonies againſt Infant-Baptiſm, which have been paſt all Contradiction, proved to be meer Falſhood and Forgeries, take that Inſtance, *pag.* 91. where he quotes the *Magdeburgenſes*, as cited by Mr. *Danvers*. It is true, our Author has the Wit to leave out part of Mr. *Danvers*'s pretended Citation, wherein that Falſhood did particularly lie, but he has the Diſingenuity to conceal part of what thoſe worthy Authors ſay, which had he produced,

would have quite ſpoiled their Teſtimony, ſeeing they poſitively affirm, that Infants as well as the Adult, were in Primitive Times baptized. Now how Men of any Conſcience can uſe ſuch diſingenuous Methods, is to me a Riddle. I ſhall only add, *O my Soul, enter not thou into their Secrets.* But to come to the Book: as for what he ſays in his firſt Chapter, we are fully of the ſame mind with himſelf; the four next Chapters are wholly taken up in Attempts to prove, that it's only Baptiſm by dipping or plunging the whole Body into Water, which is true Baptiſm. I ſhall not ſay much to this, having already given a clear account of the Grounds on which I judg that our Lord Chriſt hath not indiſpenſably tied up his Church to that manner of adminiſtring that Ordinance, which Mr. *Keach* may conſider if he pleaſe. At preſent I ſhall only obſerve a few things in thoſe Attempts made by our Author, and paſs on.

Firſt, I cannot but obſerve how he will needs oppoſe Rantiſm or Sprinkling, to Dipping, or Plunging, or immerging the whole Body under Water, as tho that were, if not the only, yet the main and moſt principal uſed manner of Pedo-Baptiſts adminiſtring that Ordinance: hence he ſtrenuouſly applies himſelf to prove that there is a difference between ῥαντίζω and βαπτίζω, and that the word βαπτίζω cannot ſignify to ſprinkle; and this I ſuppoſe he doth *ad faciendum populum*, ſeeing he cannot but know that many, if not moſt, or all Pedo-baptiſts, eſpecially who conſcienciouſly make the Word their Rule, adminiſter that Ordinance by waſh-

ing,

ing, or pouring Water upon the Face of the Party baptized, whether Infant or Adult.

Secondly, It may be obſerved, That whereas our Author inſiſts ſo much upon the word βαπτίζω, to prove that baptizing muſt neceſſarily be by dipping or plunging under the Water, and that as eſſential unto true Baptiſm: It is certain, and himſelf acknowledges it, that this word is of a large Signification: Firſt, It ſignifies to Die, and this ſeems to be its firſt and moſt native Signification. This ſome of his own Authors, and others might be mentioned, do affirm; and anſwerably it ſignifies to plunge, *Tingendi cauſa*, in order to Dying or giving ſome new Colour; the primitive word being taken from a Dyers Fat. Hence we read in Prophane Authors ἐρία βαπτεῖν, *tingere lanas*, to die Wool; ſo δίβαφον πορφύρα, double-dyed Purple. Hence it will follow, that barely to dip or plunge into Water, is not the firſt or primary Signification of the Word; It notes ſomething more than a bare dipping or plunging into Water; it notes ſuch a Dipping or Plunging as whereby the thing dipped or plunged may receive a new Die or Colour which it had not before. 2*ly*, It ſignifies barely to dip or plunge, and it ſignifies dipping or plunging; becauſe things died are dipped or plunged into that Liquor or Liquid Matter they are dyed in. 3*ly*. It ſignifies to waſh, ſo Mr. *Lee* (one of the Authors cited by Mr. *Keach*) tells us, that the word βαπτίζω, as *Heſychus*, *Stephanus*, *Scapula* and *Budeus*, the great Maſters of the Greek Tongue, make good, by very many Inſtances and

Allegations out of Classick Writers, importeth no more than Ablution or Washing; so that according unto these great Masters of the Greek Tongue, Ablution or Washing, is as proper a Signification of this word, as dipping or plunging. Hence for any to argue meerly from the Signification of the Word, is exceeding weak, and utterly unconvincing. But,

3*dly*. It may be observed, that whereas our Author saith, that when it signifies Washing, it is such a Washing as is done by dipping so much as is washed; it must be said it is otherwise. Take it only of washing the Hands, tho other things might be mentioned, so the washing the Hands or the Feet of the Priest under the Law is included in those διαφοροὶ βαπτισμοὶ, mentioned *Hebrews* 9. 10. compared with *Exod.* 30. 18. So the Pharisees washing their hands before Meat, is called *Baptisme*, Luk. 11. 38. where it's said they marvelled that he, meaning Christ, ὁτι ὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη, that he had not been baptized. Now it is certain in washing their Hands they did not always, if ordinarily, dip or plunge them into the Water, but had Water poured upon them: see 2 *Kings* 3. 11. So that the word, according unto its use in the Scripture, may be rendred very fitly to wash; and signifies such washing, as is by pouring Water on the Party or Subject washed. I shall not fear to affirm, that the washing one Part of the Body by pouring Water, is according to the Scripture-Acceptation of the word, true Baptism. Doctor *Owen*, who understood the Greek as well as most in

in his Day, if not as any in any former Age, tells us, That Baptiſm is any kind of waſhing, whether by dipping or ſprinkling, putting the thing to be waſhed into the Water, or applying Water unto it, ſee *Heb.* 9. 10. And how invalid then is his Argument taken from the bare ſignification of the word.

4*thly.* It may be obſerved, that whereas our Author tells us, that Dr. *Du-Veil* affirms, that the conſtant Practice of the Univerſal Church till about the Year 1305, was to baptize by Immerſion, it muſt be ſaid, that ſuppoſe Mr. *Keach* doth faithfully cite him, he was under a very great Miſtake, the contrary may be evidenced paſt all rational Contradiction, only to inſtance in thoſe at preſent, called *Clinici*, which were ſuch as were baptized on their Beds, of whom we read at leaſt 1000 Years before that; and hence note,

5*thly.* The utter Improbability that our Lord Chriſt ſhould bind up his Church to ſuch a manner of adminiſtring this Ordinance, as would neceſſarily exclude many thouſands from it, or expoſe them to apparent danger of Life, as in the caſe of Infants, the dueneſs of whoſe Baptiſm I hope hath been ſufficiently proved; ſo in the caſe of Perſons in extream old Age under lingring Sickneſs and Weakneſs, eſpecially ſuch who have lived Valitudinarian Lives all their days; but he ſeems evidently to have uſed this word βαπτιζω, which admits of different Modes of adminiſtring this Ordinance, either by dipping, or plunging, or waſhing, whether by pouring Water upon the Subject, or otherwiſe

wiſe applying Water unto it, and a liberty of adminiſtring it either way, hath conſtantly been maintained in the Church.

I ſhall only further note, in the laſt place, that whereas our Opponents generally inſiſt upon *John* 3. 23. where the Evangeliſt gives the Reaſon of *John*'s baptizing in *Ænon*, to be the muchneſs of Water being there; and it muſt be granted, they are ſomewhat countenanced in their Notion by our late Annotators, and ſome others; this I would ſay, that neither the Learned Annotator upon that Book, nor our Brethren ſeem duly to conſider the Original, for it is not, there was πολὺ ὕδωρ much Water, but πολλὰ ὕδατα many Waters, many Streams or Rivolets of Waters; and Travellers tell us they were ſo ſhallow as not to reach above the Ankle, (ſee *Sandys* Travels) ſo that the Evangeliſt giving that as the reaſon of *John*'s baptizing there, *viz.* becauſe there were many Waters, ſeems rather to imply that ſeveral were imployed in baptizing, than that Baptiſm was adminiſtred by Immerſion, the ſmall quantity of Water there hardly admitting that way of adminiſtring the Ordinance. But I deſign Brevity, and anſwerably ſhall refer both our Author and all others to what I have ſaid in my Anſwer to Mr. *Danvers*, and alſo to Mr. *Walker*'s Treatiſe of this Subject afore referred unto, and come to the main Controverſy between us and our Brethren, and that concerns the Subjects of Baptiſm. And I call this the main Controverſy, becauſe neither my ſelf, nor, ſo far as I know, do any Pedo-baptiſts deny the Validity of Baptiſm

Baptiſm by Immerſion; neither ſhall I deny that Baptiſm was ſometime ſo adminiſtred in Primitive Times; that it was always ſo is altogether uncertain; yea, there is a very great probability that it was not. See our new *Annotations*, that Mr. *Keach* often cites upon *John* 3. 23. Therefore, I ſay, the main Controverſy is about the Subjects of Baptiſm; and the Queſtion is, Whether only Adult Believers are the Subjects of this Holy Sacrament? or, Whether their Infant-Seed are not the joint Subjects of it with themſelves? The former is affirmed by our Brethren, we affirm the latter. Our Author attempts to prove the former Two ways.

1. More laxly.

2. More Strictly and Syllogiſtically. And what he ſaith in a more lax or looſe Way, he afterwards reaſſumes and forms into Arguments. And therefore, I ſhall paſs that by, and the rather, becauſe I have already fully obviated all that he ſaith in my Anſwer to Mr. *Danvers*, who argues from the very ſame Topicks that our Author doth, (which he might have, and I ſuppoſe hath ſeen, tho' for Reaſons that may be gueſſed at by others, but are beſt known to himſelf, he hath taken no notice of) and come to his Arguments; the four firſt of which are but a repetition of what he had in a more lax or looſe way formed up into Syllogiſms, ſo that I might juſtly paſs them alſo by, but yet briefly to touch upon them.

The Firſt is this; "If there be no Word of "Inſtitution, nor any thing in the Commiſſion "of Chriſt, for the baptizing of Infants, but of "Be-

" Believers only; then not Infants, but Belie-
" vers only ought to be baptized: but the for-
" mer is true, therefore the latter.

Anſw. I find Mr. *Keach* himſelf takes (as he ought to do) Authority from Chriſt, equivalent to a Word of Inſtitution, or the expreſs mention of Infants in the Commiſſion. And that being granted, I deny his *Minor* Propoſition, and affirm, That we have full Authority from Chriſt to baptize Infants. This I have ſo fully and demonſtratively proved already, (ſome account of what I have ſaid in proof of it, may be ſeen in the foregoing Sheets) that it is ſuperfluous to add any thing more. I have proved that they are joint Subjects of the Covenant with their Parents, and as ſuch, the proper Subjects of Baptiſm. If Mr. *Keach* will ſatisfactorily anſwer the Arguments I have offered, he will do both the Church of God and my ſelf no little Service.

As for what he adds in confirmation of his *Minor* Propoſition, it is meer trifling; in brief, it is this, " 'Tis evident and owned by the Lear-
" ned, That thoſe who are enjoined to be bap-
" tized in the Commiſſion, are firſt to be taught,
" or made Diſciples.

To which I ſhall ſay, Suppoſe we have ſufficient Authority from Chriſt to baptize Infants, how evident ſoever it be, that thoſe who are enjoined to be baptized, are firſt to be taught and made Diſciples, we have ſufficient Warrant for their Baptiſm, that Authority of our Lord Chriſt is our Warrant.

2. We

2. We ſay, that Infants are included in the Commiſſion. All that are to be baptized, their Baptiſm is enjoined in the Commiſſion: But Infants are to be baptized, *Ergo*, &c. As for thoſe Learned Men he ſpeaks of, if he means that they own, That all thoſe univerſally who are enjoined to be baptized, muſt be taught, or made Diſciples, he muſt certainly intend the Learned of his own Perſwaſion; which how few they are, is ſufficiently known; neither is it of any great concern what they own or diſown in this Controverſy. As for others, what they own, concerns only the Adult; which makes nothing againſt the baptizing of Infants, whoſe right to Baptiſm comes in another way, *viz.* from their Covenant-Intereſt, as having the Promiſes made unto them as the Seed of Believing-Parents. And as for what our Author ſays in Anſwer to that Objection of ſome Pædo-Baptiſts, *viz.* "That Children are part of the "Nations commanded by Chriſt to be baptized, I ſhall paſs it by (not being concerned at all in it) and proceed;

2. He Argues from the Scriptures requiring Faith and Repentance, as Prerequiſites of all them that are to be baptized.

Anſw. I ſhall only ſay, this requires better Proof than what our Author hath here given; which I ſhall expect *ad Græcas Calendas*. He only cites *Acts* 2. 36, 37. and *Acts* 8. I ſuppoſe he hath reſpect to the 37*th* Verſe, and an Anſwer to a Queſtion in the *Rubrick*; but to how little purpoſe, is obvious unto all. That Faith and Repentance are required as Prerequiſites of all

the

the Adult that are to be baptized, is granted; but that they are required of all universally, neither is nor can be proved. Therefore to pass this, and,

3. The Sum and Substance of his Third Argument is this, "As there is no Precept, so no "Precedent in Scripture, that any besides such "as professed Faith and Repentance were bap-"tized, therefore not Infants; but only such "ought to be baptized.

Answ. In Answer whereunto, I doubt not it hath been fully proved, that we have a Precept for Infant-Baptism. See my *Infant-Baptism from Heaven*, First Part, *pag.* 114. And besides the other Revelations our Lord Christ hath made of his Will, are obliging and equivalent to a Precept. And this being granted, That because there is no Precedent in Scripture that any Infants were baptized, therefore they ought not to be baptized, is a *non sequitur*; a Precept is enough without any Precedent. But,

2. I say, We are not altogether without Precedents: Thus, in all those Households that were baptized, when yet only the Parents, or chief Governors, are recorded to have believed.

4. His Fourth Argument is this, "Because "*Paul*, who declared the whole Counsel of God "to the Churches, and Primitive Christians, never "declared any thing of Infant-Baptism; there-"fore they are not to be baptized.

Answ. I shall not at present enquire how, or in what sense *Paul* is said to have declared the whole Counsel of God. Two things I would only say: 1. That

1. That it is certain, ſo far as the Declarations *Paul* made of the Counſel of God are recorded in Scripture, he did not declare abſolutely and univerſally his whole Counſel. This is too evident than to need proof: neither is it abſurd to ſay, that the Apoſtle declared much more of the Counſel of God, than what is contained in any of his Sermons or Epiſtles, it being contained in other parts of Scripture. And for the Pen-men of the Holy Scriptures, to have ſet down the whole of what every Prophet, or our Lord Chriſt, or any of his Apoſtles declared to the Churches, had been ſuperfluous: 'tis enough that the whole Counſel of God is contained in one or another part of the Scriptures; and we are ſure they contain this part of his Counſel, that Infants ought to be baptized. But,

2. I ſay, that the Apoſtle did declare ſomething, yea, much of this part of his Counſel. For,

1. He declares, That if either Parents are Believers, then their Children are Holy, that is, Holy fœderally.

2. *Paul* declared, That the Infant-Seed of Believers do appertain to the Myſtical Body of Chriſt. He expreſly declares, that that Promiſe, *Gen.* 17. 7. was made unto Chriſt, *Gal.* 3. 16. that is, Chriſt Myſtical; and that Promiſe extended unto Infants, it being made to *Abraham*'s Seed in their Generations, (as is before proved) and this the Apoſtle perfectly underſtood.

3. He declares this as part of the Counſel of God, that all that appertain to this Myſtical Body,

Body, ought to be admitted or incorporated thereinto by Baptiſm. This I doubt not but Mr. *Keach* will readily grant.

6. He argues thus; "Whatſoever is neceſſary "to Faith or Practice, is left in the written "Word, or made known to us in the Holy "Scriptures: but Infant-Baptiſm is not con-"tained therein; therefore Infant-Baptiſm is "not of God.

Anſw. This Argument hath been already ſufficiently anticipated. I ſhall only ſay at preſent, That Infant-Baptiſm is contained in the Scriptures; and muſt ſay, the Reaſon why our Adverſaries ſee it not, is their too evidently ſhutting their Eyes againſt that Light held forth unto them: Hence all our Author's Quotations are impertinent, ſeeing we ground our Practice upon the Scriptures. Let our Author ſatisfactorily Anſwer what we have ſaid, and then let him triumph. But,

6. He argues thus; "If no Man or Woman, "at any Time or Times, were by the Almighty "God, Jeſus Chriſt, nor his Apoſtles, neither "commended for baptizing any one Child, or "Children, nor reproved for neglecting to "baptize ſuch; then Infant-Baptiſm is not of "nor from God.

Anſw. This Argument our Author ſeems to have borrowed from Mr. *Ives*; and he might have ſeen it ſufficiently baffled long ſince: See my *Infant-Baptiſm from Heaven*, Firſt Part, *p.* 300, to 310. I ſhall only add, as it is formed by Mr. *Keach*, That the Conſequence in the *Major* Propoſition needs proof. Why ſhould we impoſe

poſe upon the Spirit of God? Is it not enough that he hath revealed our Duty? What neceſſity is there that he ſhould leave upon Record a Commendation of any for the Practice of it, or a Diſcommendation for the Neglect of it? And therefore for our Author to ſay as he doth, *pag.* 69. is exceeding weak. He ſhould have proved that it is univerſally true, with reſpect to all Goſpel-Duties, at leaſt Ordinances: and that it muſt neceſſarily be ſo, let him produce a Commendation given to any Woman for participating in the Lord's Supper, or Diſcommendation for the Neglect of it. But not to ſtay upon ſuch Trifles.

7. Our Author argues, from a ſuppoſed Reflection, "That the Doctrine and Practice of "Infant-Baptiſm make upon the Honour, Care, "and Faithfulneſs of Jeſus Chriſt, our Bleſſed "Mediator, and Glorious Law-giver; he ſup-"poſes they render him leſs faithful than *Moſes*, "and the New Teſtament in one of its great "Ordinances, nay Sacraments, to lie more dark "and obſcure in God's Word, than any Law or "Ordinance in the Old Teſtament did, and "therefore cannot be of God.

Anſw. But to this, I ſay, Our Lord Chriſt hath perfectly revealed his Will relating to this practice; and it muſt be ſaid, it is from the Darkneſs and Ignorance, if not wilful Blindneſs of our Opponents, that they do not, or rather will not ſee it, and conſequently doth not at all reflect on the Honour, Care, or Faithfulneſs of Chriſt, it rather reflects upon themſelves; and this I ſhall add to ſpeak, with utmoſt holy fear and trembling in ſuch tremendous Matters,

that it had vaſtly more reflected upon the Honour, Care, and Faithfulneſs of our Lord Chriſt, had he not declared his Will to us, that Infants ſhould not be Baptized, ſuppoſing that had been his Will, then his revealing it no plainer than he hath done, when it is his Will that they ſhould be Baptized doth: But for this, ſee my Anſwer to Mr. *Danvers*, pag. 56, & 57.

But to come to our Author's laſt Argument, which is this; "That Ordinance God has made "no Promiſe to Perſons in their Obedience "thereto, nor denounced any Threatning or "Puniſhment on ſuch who ſlight, neglect, and "contemn it, is no Ordinance of God; but God "has made no Promiſe to Perſons that Baptize "their Children, nor denounced no Threatning "nor Puniſhment; therefore Infant-Baptiſm is "no Ordinance of God.

Anſw. As previous to an Anſwer to this Argument, it may be inquired what Mr. *Keach* means here by an Ordinance of God? if he means any Act or Part of Worſhip that is contra-diſtinguiſhed from all other Acts or part of Worſhip, as preaching the Word is an Ordinance contra-diſtinguiſhed from the Celebration of the Sacraments; then I ſhall readily grant his Concluſion, and do affirm, That Baptiſm, as applied to Infants, is no diſtinct Ordinance from Baptiſm as applied to grown Perſons, no more than Baptiſm as applied to Women, is a diſtinct Ordinance from Baptiſm as applied to Men; or as it is applied to young Men, is a diſtinct Ordinance from Baptiſm as applied to old Men; 'tis not any Conſideration or Circumſtance relating to the Subjects of an Ordinance, that makes that an

an Ordinance distinct from the same Ordinance, as the Subjects of it fall under other Considerations or Circumstances; Circumstances relating to the Subjects of Ordinances, diversifies not Ordinances. And therefore if Mr. *Keach* understand this Term Ordinance in this sence, let him make the utmost he can of his Argument, we are not concerned in it. But, 2*dly*. If he mean by Ordinance, any Duty injoyned by God respective to his Ordinances, take it of Baptism in particular; then I deny the Consequence in his Major Proposition, and affirm, That that may be a Duty, unto the Performance of which no particular, explicite or expres Promise is made, or against the Neglecters or Contemners of which no particular or explicite Threatning is denounced; 'tis enough that God hath revealed our Duty, and promised Rewards in the general to the Obedient, and denounced Threatnings and Punishments on the Disobedient; and how many Duties might be mentioned that have no particular, explicit or expres Promise made to the Performance of them, nor any such Threatning or Punishment denounced against those that neglect or contemn them. But to hasten, having, tho briefly, yet I hope satisfactorily shewed the Invalidity, yea Vanity of these Reasonings of Mr. *Keach*, to prove, that the Adult are only the proper Subjects of Baptism; I shall now briefly consider what he hath said to invalidate our Argument for Infant-Baptism taken from the Covenant entred with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7. which, he rightly saith, is the main and great Argument which we bring for our Practice. Indeed he in reciting our Argument

hath confuſedly jumbled ſeveral things together, which I ſuppoſe he will not find ſo jumbled together in any Pleader for Infant-Baptiſm: In brief, our Argument is this; If the Infant-Seed of Believers are in common with their Parents the true and proper Subjects of the Covenant of Grace, then they are the true and proper Subjects of the Token of that Covenant, which now is Baptiſm: but the former is true; therefore the latter. Now let us ſee what our Author has ſaid to this Argument; and it may be obſerved, that he doth not at leaſt expreſly deny that Covenant to be the Covenant of Grace, yea, implicitly he grants it ſo to be, wherein he leaves, if not the moſt of thoſe who, eſpecially of late, have pleaded the ſame Cauſe with himſelf: I ſuppoſe he hath ſeen the unſucceſsfulneſs of their Attempts, and therefore was not willing *perdere oleum* in proving what he knew could never be proved. But he offers four things to invalidate our Argument: 1. He ſaith, and is very poſitive, That this Covenant was not made with *Abraham*, and his Carnal (he ſhould have ſaid Natural) Seed according to the Fleſh: But that it was made with him and his Spiritual Seed, and ſuch who had the Faith of *Abraham*. And he ſeems greatly to wonder that all Men ſhould not be convinced by thoſe three Scriptures compared together, *Gal.* 3. 16. & 29. 9. *Rom.* 7. 8. that is, to ſee how confidently he expreſſeth himſelf, *pag.* 100. one would think the Apoſtle might be believed in his expounding that Text, meaning that in *Gen.* 17. 7. *Pag.* 106. when he had feigned an Objection that ſome might make, which he thus fra-

frameth, "Say what you will, the Promiſe and "Covenant of Grace was to *Abraham*, and his "Natural Off-ſpring. He returns this Anſwer, "Why, Do you not believe the Apoſtle who tells "you the quite contrary? So once again, after he had cited thoſe fore-mentioned Scriptures, he adds, "Could the Apoſtle in plainer terms "have detected the Error of theſe Men? he means thoſe who ſay that Covenant was made with *Abraham* and his Seed according to the Fleſh. Strange Confidence! But who ſo blind as they that ſhut their Eyes? But in Reply unto this, I ſhall only ſay, Our Author lies under a double Miſtake; the former is about what we affirm, the latter about the mind and meaning of the Apoſtle in thoſe places. 1. The Miſtake he lies under about what we affirm, is this; he ſuppoſes we ſay, that that Covenant was made with *Abraham* and all his Natural Off-ſpring, whether immediately or mediately deſcended from him meerly as they were his Natural Off-ſpring, whereas both my ſelf and many others, both formerly and of late, do affirm, that that Covenant was actually entred only with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed, immediately proceeding from his own Loins, and that all his Natural Seed mediately deſcended from him, held their Intereſt in the Covenant, either as his Spiritual Seed, or as their Infant-Seed; and that *Abraham*'s Natural Seed immediatly deſcending from his own Loins, were taken into this Covenant with *Abraham* himſelf, is made evident paſt all rational Contradiction: See my Infant-Baptiſm from Heaven, firſt Part, *Pag.* 2. and ſo on; neither doth the Apoſtle in any of the

the places mentioned in the leaſt contradict this.

2. Our Author miſtakes about the mind and meaning of the Apoſtle in this Scripture, he ſuppoſes that he excludes both *Abraham*'s Natural Seed, whether immediate or mediate, as alſo the Infant-Seed of all Believers, from this Covenant and the Promiſes of it, which never entred into the Thoughts of the Apoſtle to do. As for that in *Rom.* 9.7, 8. ſee my Infant-Baptiſm, *Part* 1. *Chap.* 7. throughout, where I have proved that the Apoſtle is ſo far from excluding *Abraham*, or any Believer's Natural Seed from this Covenant, or any Promiſes of it, that as to *Abraham*'s immediate Natural Seed he neceſſarily ſuppoſes their Intereſt in it. And for *Gal.* 3. 16, 29. I ſhall only ſay, that in caſe that Covenant was entred with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed immediately deſcending from him, and all his Spiritual Seed in their Generations, including their Infants with them, which I have demonſtrated that it was; the Apoſtle is ſo far from excluding them, that it's paſt all rational Contradiction he doth include them; the Promiſe is made unto Chriſt, that is, Chriſt Myſtical, as our Author himſelf acknowledges, but the Promiſe was made to *Abraham* and his Seed, in their Generation, including Infants with their Parents, therefore will we believe the Apoſtle, Infants with their Parents are included in that term *Chriſt*; it is Chriſt Myſtical, including himſelf as Head, *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations, that the Covenant was entred with: For the Lord to ſay unto *Abraham*, *I will be a God unto thee, and unto thy Seed, in their Generations*, is all one, as the Apoſtle expounds it, as to

ſay

ſay, I will be a God unto Chriſt; ſo that *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations, ſtill including himſelf as Head, conſtitute and make up Myſtical Chriſt. Now then thoſe two Miſtakes of our Author being rectified, his firſt Conſideration vaniſhes, and makes not the leaſt head of Oppoſition againſt our Arguments. But, 2. he puts a Suppoſition that we could prove all the Children of Believers to be in that Covenant made with *Abraham*, yet our Author thinks it doth not from hence follow, that they may be baptized, unleſs we can ſhow the Lord Chriſt has injoyned them ſo to be. But to this I would ſay, Would he really grant this, the main of our Controverſy were at an end. And will he grant this, as will he yield unto Truth he muſt do, then I ſhall refer him to theſe three Arguments I have laid down to prove, That they not only may, but ought to be baptized. See my Infant-Baptiſm, *Part* 1. *Ch.* 5. Till which Arguments are anſwered, which Mr. *Keach* may do at his Leiſure, if he pleaſes, it is utterly ſuperfluous to add any more. We ſhall not deny what he hath ſaid, *viz.* That it's not enough to ſay Children are in the Covenant, therefore they ought to be baptized: yet let me ſay, this would carry a fair probability in it; but this I ſay, If our Lord Chriſt hath aſſured us, that it is his Will that being in Covenant they ought to be baptized, as thoſe Arguments fully prove he hath; Then that is enough to warrant our baptizing of them. Hence as to our Author's two other Conſiderations, they only deſigning the Confirmation of this Aſſertion, I ſhall ſay nothing, eſpecially having

having touched upon what he ſaith in them in my Anſwers to Mr. *Grantham*, and therefore ſhall come to a Cloſe, not finding my ſelf concerned in his Anſwers to the other Scripture-Proofs and Arguments Pedo-Baptiſts produce for the baptizing of Infants. I ſhall only further deſire both Mr. *Keach*, and thoſe others, whoſe Books I have now conſidered, ſeriouſly and impartially to weigh what I have ſaid in Anſwer to what they affirm concerning Circumciſion, its being only a Seal unto *Abraham* of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, and not ſo to any of his Seed, in my Infant-Baptiſm from Heaven, *Pag.* 228, unto 236. and ſhall only add my hearty Deſire our Opponents will truly and impartially weigh what hath been offered unto them, and determine, as they will anſwer it at the great Day of Accounts, which we all profeſs our ſelves Expectants of; and in caſe any of them will return any Anſwer to what I have written upon this Subject, I deſire they would do it with what ſpeed conveniently they may: My Age now tells me my appearing before our Lord Chriſt cannot be very far off, and I would gladly, either be convinced of my Error, ſuppoſe I have erred, (Infallibility I pretend not unto) which yet at preſent I am above any ſuſpicion that I have done, or may have opportunity to ſhew them the Inſufficiency of the Anſwers returned by them.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 24. line 10. read *ſome*. P. 31. l. 10. after *made* add *muſt be fixed*. P. 33. l. 19. read *inſtitutes*.